REMARKS

Claims 1-43 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the current amendment, claims 1-9, 12-20, 22-37 and 40-43 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amended claims can be found at least at paragraphs 29, 30 and 42. Upon entry of the current amendment, claims 1-43 will be pending in this application, of which claims 1, 17 and 29 are independent. Applicant submits that pending claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

I. Claims 1-43 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-42 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343 to Eaton et al. ("Eaton") under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. Claims 18-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. Claims 30-42 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29 as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element recited in amended independent claims 1, 17 and 29.

A. Independent Claim 1 Patentably Distinguished Over Eaton

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claim 1 is

directed towards a method for providing access to remote applications. Amended independent claim 1 recites receiving authentication information associated with a user, authenticating the user, and identifying a plurality of disconnected application sessions already associated with the user in response to the received information. The method also recites identifying from a rule source a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user. The method further recites determining via the rule that the user is required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions. A connection is established between a client computer operated by the user and the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions in response to the received information. Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton does <u>not</u> disclose identifying from a rule source a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and determining via the rule that the user is required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions. Rather, Eaton is directed towards using computer and account identifiers to transfer client data from a first session with a first messaging client to a second session with a second messaging client. Eaton does not describe identifying from a rule source a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user via any of the messaging clients. Eaton also does not describe a rule that determines if a user a required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a disconnected messaging client. Thus, Eaton fails to disclose identifying from a rule source a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and determining via the rule that the user is required, permitted or

forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Eaton fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits independent claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. Thus, Eaton fails to detract from the patentability of dependent claims 2-16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

B. Independent Claims 17 Patentably Distinguished Over Eaton

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claim 17 as amended is directed to a method for providing remote access to a plurality of application sessions. The method recites transmitting authentication information associated with a user operating one of a first computer or a second computer, and receiving a user prompt indicating whether to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions associated with the user during operation of the first computer and receiving application output from the first application session in response to transmission of the user's indication to connect to the first application session. Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton does not disclose receiving a user prompt indicating whether to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions associated with the user during operation of the first computer and receiving application output from the

first application session in response to transmission of the user's indication to connect to the first

application session. Rather, Eaton is directed towards transferring client data from a first user

session of a first messaging client to a second user session of a second messaging client. Eaton

does not describe providing the user a choice of whether to connect to a disconnected messaging

client. Eaton also does not describe transmitting the output of a disconnected messaging client to

the user in response to the user's indication to connect to the disconnected messaging client.

Thus, Easton fails to disclose receiving a user prompt indicating whether to connect to a first

application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions associated

with the user during operation of the first computer and receiving application output from the

first application session in response to transmission of the user's indication to connect to the first

application session.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Eaton fails to disclose each and every feature

of amended independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant submits independent claim 17 is patentable

and in condition for allowance. Claims 18-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable

subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. Thus, Eaton fails to detract from the

patentability of dependent claims 18-28. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the

Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

C. Independent Claims 29 Patentably Distinguished Over Eaton

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found,

either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claim 29 is

directed towards a server for providing access to remote applications. The server includes a

network module for receiving authentication information associated with a user operating a client

computer, and an authentication module for authenticating the user via the authentication information received from the user. The server also includes a data store and a rule source. The data store enumerates a plurality of disconnected application sessions associated with the user. The rule source provides one or more rules governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user. The one on or more rules identify whether to one of require, permit or forbid the user's connection to a disconnected application session. The server also includes a server process for connecting the client computer operated by the user to a first application session of the plurality of disconnected application sessions enumerated in the data store in response to authentication of the received information and in accordance with the one or more rules. Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton does <u>not</u> disclose a rule source providing one or more rules governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and that identify whether to one of require, permit or forbid the user's connection to a disconnected application session. Rather, Eaton is directed towards using a server to transfer client data from a session with a first messaging client to a second session with a second messaging client. Eaton does not describe a rule source providing one or more rules governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user via any of the messaging clients. Eaton also does not describe a rule that determines if a user is required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a disconnected messaging client. Thus, Eaton fails to disclose a rule source providing one or more rules governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user and that identify whether to one of require, permit or forbid the user's connection to a disconnected application session.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Easton fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 29. Thus, Applicant submits claim 29 is patentable and in

condition for allowance. Claims 30-42 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29 as amended. Thus, Eaton fails to detract from the patentability of dependent claims 30-43. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 29-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: August 3, 2007   /Christopher J. McKenna/
                                      Christopher J. McKenna, Esq.
                                      Registration No. 53,302
                                      Attorney for Applicant

                                      Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
                                      2 International Place
                                      Boston, MA 02110
                                      (617) 248-5000